DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 787 CS 500 707

AUTHOR Friedrich, Gustav W.; And Others
TITLE Competency-Based Teacher Education; Group 1 Report of the Education Priorities Division of the Speech Communication Association.
INSTITUTION Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 73
NOTE 36p.; Reports presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Speech Communication Association (9th, Chicago, July 12-14, 1973); Also in "Proceedings" published by Speech Communication Association, edited by R. Jeffrey and W. Work, pp. 10-12, pp. 22-50

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Models; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Program Design; *Program Planning; *Speech Education; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on performance-based teacher education in speech communication as an alternative to the traditional method of preparing speech teachers. Following an introductory argument stating the case for performance-based teacher education in speech communication, contents include: "Competency Based Teacher Training: A Perspective on a Set of Competencies"; "Your Introduction to a Pilot Program in Communication Education," which discusses criteria and guidelines for an intern program in teacher preparation; "Competency-Based Instruction: An Application to a Methods of Teaching Communication Course," which examines the assumptions on which a competency-based model of instruction is grounded; and "Evaluation and PBTE," which discusses the establishment of criteria and standards by which to evaluate students in a performance-based teacher education program. (RB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Speech Communication Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ED 091787

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION PRIORITIES DIVISION

OVERVIEW

R. R. Allen, Division Director

This division sought to establish educational priorities related to three important topic areas: competency-based teacher education, communication in secondary school language arts curricula, and implications of university reorganization of speech departments for the preparation of secondary school communication teachers. After a brief divisional meeting on Friday, July 13, participants met in groups for the remainder of the day. The groups were chaired by Gustav Friedrich, Edward Pappas, and Barbara Lieb-Brilhart.

Each group began with a consideration of stimulus statements. The groups were then divided into interest groups to explore the issues raised by the stimulus statements and to arrive at recommendations.

On Saturday morning, July 14, the Education Priorities Division met in plenary session to consider the recommendations prepared by the three groups. Following a report by the three group chairpersons, a spirited discussion ensued. Since time was limited, no attempt was made to secure divisional consensus on the recommendations advanced. Thus, the recommendations presented in this report should be taken as position statements of the participants in the group offering each of the recommendations.

In the following three sections, a summary of the deliberations of each of the groups is provided. The report concludes with a brief summary statement.

GROUP ONE: COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

Gustav W. Friedrich, Chairperson
Cassandra L. Book, Recorder

Traditionally, teacher educators have assumed that if a student accumulates a specified number of credit hours with a C average or better and survives the student teaching experience, he or she is ready to begin teaching. In recent years, however, teacher educators in speech communication have expressed increasing dissatisfaction with such an assumption and have been actively searching for viable alternatives. One such alternative, competency-based or performance-based teacher education (CBTE), was selected as the focus for this group's discussion. To facilitate discussion, activities of the group were divided into two phases: an input phase and a deliberation and recommendation phase.

Input Phase

The input phase consisted of four brief commissioned stimulus statements: Philip P. Amato, Emerson College, explained the case for CBTE; L. E. Sarbaugh, Michigan State University, discussed some of the competencies which speech teachers need; William D. Brooks, Purdue University, considered the issue of how speech education programs can best develop such competencies; and Kathleen M. Galvin, Northwestern University, raised the question of how the results of CBTE programs can best be evaluated. These stimulus statements are presented as Appendix A.

CS 500 707

Deliberations and Recommendations

The deliberation phase began with a discussion of the issues raised by the four stimulus presentations. After brainstorming for ideas to share with colleagues, the group subdivided in order to prepare the series of recommendations which follow. With minimum reservations, it was the consensus of the group that:

1. Departments of speech communication should adopt a competency-based approach to teacher education (CBTE). This recommendation is based upon a rationale that CBTE:
   a. Provides precise expressions of what is to be learned in advance of instruction and the criteria by which the student becomes aware of his/her own competencies.
   b. Permits identification of entry and exit points irrespective of time or course sequence limits.
   c. Provides an environment conducive to individualized instruction.
   d. Allows the student greater freedom of choice for achieving goals within the teacher education program.
   e. Provides a basis for assessing teacher education by constituencies concerned with accountability.
   f. Encourages more specific and continuous feedback to individual learners.
2. In regard to the nature of competencies, we should identifiy general areas of competence applicable to all teachers as well as competencies unique to speech communication teachers. These areas of competence should be developed in behavioral terms and should encompass areas such as:
   a. Characteristics of the learner
   b. Subject matter (particular reference to examples of speech communication competencies are expressed in the addendum to L.E. Sarbaugh's paper which is included in Appendix A.)
   c. Skills and resources necessary in the management of the learning environment (examples of such competencies are identified in William Brook's paper which is included in Appendix A)
   d. Professional context in which the teacher operates
   e. The learning ecology (including such influences as the environmental, societal, and cultural systems)
   f. Self
   g. Various roles that the teacher plays
3. Teacher educators should develop cognitive, affective, and psychomotor competencies in their students at <u>all</u> levels of learning.

4. A CBTE program must have a strong research component to allow it to adapt to changing circumstances and to provide the basis for examining the assumptions underlying the approach.

5. SCA/ERIC should commission bibliographies:

   a. Of available instruments for implementing and evaluating CBTE

   b. Of related research available on CBTE

   c. Of instructional aids, model programs, and technology available to educators involved in CBTE

6. The SCA should develop CBTE in-service modules.

7. The SCA should develop a program of national, regional, and state workshops on CBTE.

8. Speech communication teachers should investigate the possibility of interdisciplinary cooperation in the development of CBTE programs including the specification of competencies which speech teachers are uniquely qualified to develop.

GROUP TWO: COMMUNICATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOL LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULA

Edward J. Pappas, Chairperson

Contemporary secondary school teachers of speech communication are faced with many challenges. They are asked to totally redefine the substance of their instruction and to achieve synthesis with their peers in cognate disciplines. They are challenged to become more systematic and accountable in their instruction: to specify with precision the competencies they seek to perfect and the standards against which their instruction is to be measured. They are encouraged to use instructional technology and to individualize instruction. They are asked to focus on process rather than on product, to stress experiential curricula, and to encourage the formation of sound values. The purpose of this group was to consider some of the problems experienced by secondary school teachers of communication as they seek to be responsive to these, and other, challenges.

Input Phase

Nine stimulus statements were presented at the opening general session of this group. Each paper dealt with a specific concern. James Gibson discussed the problem of articulation and overlap between high school and college curricula. Lyman Steil raised questions concerning competencies in communication needed by high school students. Richard and Linda Heun examined alternative strategies for studying communication. Three high school teachers, Margaret Miller, Gloria Lauderback, and Cynthia Baston presented approaches to the basic high school speech course for scrutiny and discussion. David Markham explored the question of instructional technology. Jo Sprague confronted the question of criteria for evaluating the secondary language arts curricula. Finally, Edward L. McGlone discussed the necessity for evaluating outcomes of language arts instruction as the professional obligation of all teachers. These stimulus statements are presented as Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

Commissioned Stimulus Statements

on

Competency-Based Teacher Education

Education Priorities Division Group One

Gus Friedrich, Chairperson

THE CASE FOR CBTE IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Philip P. Amato
Emerson College

Although competency-based or performance-based teacher education may be viewed as another educational innovation, the concept from which it emerges is neither new nor restricted to teacher training. Over the past two decades a great deal of attention has been devoted to the student as an individual learner rather than as a member of a class or group. Those concerned with education have also devoted a great deal of time and money in an effort to develop ways that ensure actual rather than expected learner performance. Education, in short, is rapidly becoming a learner-oriented, learner-paced process. The concept of accountability, behavioral objectives, criterion-referenced measurement, feedback loops and devices, prescribed or individualized learning, and simulated technology reflect this shift in the focus of education. Competency-based teacher education represents this learner performance orientation and its educational process in the training of teachers.

In the brief time allotted to me this morning, I shall attempt to present an abbreviated case for competency-based teacher education in speech communication. The case is based upon three assumptions.
(1) The concept of competency-based instruction is consistent with the goals of teacher training and superior to traditional methods.
(2) The shift to this type of training is already evident.
(3) The bases for the competency-based system are presently operative in speech communication education.

Traditional teacher education is basically a course-credit accounting system and has been characterized as "experienced based."[1] It assumes that if a student experiences a specified number of courses or credit hours, he or she is ready to begin teaching. On the other hand, a performance-based approach assumes that demonstrated competency is the true index of teaching readiness. The prospective teacher is required to demonstrate an ability to promote learning or exhibit knowledge and skills known to promote it. In lieu of specified courses or credit hours, a competency-based teacher education program contains a set of performance goals that are made explicit, in rigorous detail and in advance of instruction, and the prospective teacher is held accountable for achieving them.[2]

Beyond this basic definition, there is no specific set of elements or components that must be incorporated within a system in order for it to be considered competency-based. Nevertheless, there are several elements or components that usually surface in discussions attempting to characterize competency-based systems and found to be common within established programs.[3] Briefly, curricula tend to be organized into mini-courses and small units called "instructional modules" rather than courses. Behavioral objectives, systematic observation instruments, and criterion-referenced measures are employed throughout the training process. Mastery of knowledge and skills is the principal goal in most units of instruction and developed both within and outside the training institutions via instructional modules, mini-courses, microteaching, field practica, and simulated technology such as, films, audio and videotape recordings, games, and programed instruction.

Feedback loops and devices are built into the total program so that both the student and training program can monitor actual rather than expected performance. Moreover, the data-yield from these feedback inputs serves as the basis for the research component of the system.

Finally, the nature of the components in a competency-based system allows each prospective teacher to develop at his or her own rate of learning. It is the achievement of the performance goals that usually dictates the amount of time a student remains in a particular training area or phase.

Although I believe that the case for competency-based programs in speech communication teacher education can rest on the merits of the concept alone, the state of the art of teacher education, in general, enhances the conceptual arguments. There is sufficient evidence at this time to assume that competency-based teacher education will become the accepted system in the near future. It has already achieved the status of being an "in-term." It has been discussed at many conferences and conventions and was the theme of the 1973 national conference of the Association of Teacher Educators. Numerous articles and references have appeared in the professional and popular literature and several books on the topic have appeared on the market. Moreover, the number of institutions that have either incorporated or have begun to incorporate competency-based components within their teacher training programs is rapidily growing. Equally important is the widespread acceptance of this approach to teacher education by the federal government, state and local boards of education, and certification bureaus. A number of states have adopted or are considering adopting a competency-based approach as an alternative to, or in lieu of, the current course-accounting system. A large number of states are philosophically committed to competency-based recertification principles. In Arizona, beginning in 1974, recertification after two years will be based on a performance evaluation.[4] Finally, forty-four states have passed legislation adopting mutual guidelines for interstate reciprocity certification.[5] The Interstate Certification Compact, as it is called, employs an approved-program approach in which the preparatory institution, and not the state, establishes the criteria. However, the initial and subsequent approval of programs by state certification bureaus are based on the preparatory institution's ability to provide procedures that produce teachers with demonstrable teaching competencies.

Given the merits of a competency-based approach to teacher training and the flurry of activity within the field of teacher education and certification, there is yet another reason for considering its potential success in training speech communication teachers. It is this: many of the components of competency-based instruction have been successfully employed in speech communication education. Put another way, the use of behavioral objectives, instructional modules, mini-courses, criterion-referenced measures, programed instruction, and simulated technology are already part of the speech communication education process - - so are knowledge and skills mastery-learning techniques. What remains to be done is to build these components into the programs of speech communication teacher education.

The implications of such a goal, if achieved, are far reaching.

1. The profession would have a clear notion of what knowledge and skills it believes are important to the prospective teacher of speech communication.

2. The prospective teacher would know, in explicit and rigorous terms and in advance of instruction, the performance objectives that he or she must demonstrate in order to be certified as ready for teaching.

3. Because of the nature of competency-based teacher education, the program of training will be more individualized and geared to the nature of the learner.

There are other reasons why the field of speech communication should consider a competency-based approach to teacher training, but time does not permit us to consider them here. So on the basis of what I have presented, I rest my case.

* * * * *

FOOTNOTES

[1]Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art? (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education 1971), p. 1.

[2]Elam, p. 1.

[3]Examples of competency-based teacher education programs for elementary schools are described in A Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers, ed. Joel Burdin and Kaliopee Lanzillotti (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969). Also, see H. Del Schalock, "BEPD, NCERD, and Teacher Education That Makes a Demonstrable Difference," The Power of Competency Based Teacher Education, ed. Benjamin Rosner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 170.

[4]"Performance Recertification - - What Is It?," unpublished paper, Arizona Department of Education (October 1972)

[5]Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education, 4th ed. (Salt Lake City: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1971).

COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER TRAINING:

A Perspective on a Set of Competencies

L. E. Sarbaugh
Michigan State University

To begin my part of this session, I'd like to invite you to think a bit about your educational philosophy. Each of us has a philosophy, but we don't always make it explicit, nor do we always recognize the ways in which that philosophy determines our decisions about what to teach and how to teach.

If we go back to the very early history of man, we find that one's elders and peers were the main teachers, along with a lot of trial and success learning. This learning was not in a formal classroom, but in the daily routines of living together. In educational philosophy and educational methods courses we refer to that approach as "learning by doing."

As societies became more and more technologically oriented and population densities increased, we developed more and more complex organizational structures to assume a major role in the educational process. In the course of that type of development, we have often created learning environments which were isolated from the behaviors which we later expected the learners to perform. This may leave the learner capable of talking about concepts and skills without being able to use them. I believe this suggests increasing the emphasis on "direct experience" (intern or apprenticeship) learning.

I am not denying that we have always had some form of intern or apprenticeship training at some point in the life span and learning of most individuals. The point that I'd like to have us reflect on for awhile is the location and extent of that type of experience in the whole spectrum of learning experiences available to the individual. I believe we have restricted the direct experience type of learning (via intern or apprenticeship experiences) far too much, and have provided it too late in the chain of experiences. But I do see a reversal of that trend. The kind of program we are engaged in here today is indicative of the change in direction. That's why I'm excited about the potential outcomes of conferences such as this and feel encouraged about the future.

I see the changes taking place in teacher training as an encouraging sign for the entire educational process. The philosophies we discuss and model with the teacher trainees will eventually, I believe, be reflected in their approach to teaching, and in the kinds of learning experiences they demand for those students for whom they have some responsibility.

I'd like to share with you a one-page statement of some guidelines I have made explicit for myself within the past three years. I see these guidelines as a backdrop against which I would like us to look at competency-based teacher training.

SOME GUIDELINES FOR THE SCHOOL I'D LIKE FOR MY CHILD

1) I want a school in which my child:

   a) Knows that someone cares enough about him to enjoy, with him, the thrill he feels in his learning and growth.

b) Experiences democracy as a model of behavior.

2). I want a school which is bold enough to believe you can teach anything to anyone at some level.

3) I want a school which will help my child grow in his ability to:

a) Set learning objectives which he can achieve and observe when he has achieved them.

b) Look at the world around him and analyze situations in terms of a set of values which express concern for the well-being of others.

c) Pose alternative courses of action to relieve injustices among men.

d) Recognize that the most crucial problems facing all societies do not have simple "right-wrong," "yes-no," solutions.

e) Assess alternative courses of action in terms of which has the highest probability of producing an outcome which is consistent with the values of honesty, integrity, and world brotherhood.

f) Evaluate his own progress toward his learning objectives, recognizing that others' evaluations of his progress is one check point in his self-evaluation.

4) I want a school which will:

a) See the evaluation process as contributing to learning by providing corrective guidelines for further growth. Such evaluation would take into account both individual growth and standard of performance, allowing for different starting points and different maturation rates.

b) Create an attitude toward learning which will stimulate children to want to continue studying and learning throughout life.

c) Provide an opportunity for the academically advanced and the less advanced to each continue his study and learning at a pace he finds stimulating, a pace which avoids withdrawal either from boredom or from a sense of being unable to learn.

d) Recognize that an individual can no longer be a storehouse of all knowledge, that central to learning is the ability to analyze and synthesize, and that these abilities can be learned in a variety of contexts.

5) This requires a school system in which parents, students, school staff, and others in the community see themselves as partners in the growth and development of children. It requires that we continually look ahead 10-15 years in trying to predict the demands society will make on graduates, then use what we see as the basis for development of our school system.

Admittedly, these are broad and general statements. How do we go about teaching our students to create the kind of learning environment I've set forth above, assuming that we accept that as our goal? I start with another assumption which we should

make explicit, namely, that the role of the teacher is that of manager of a communication environment. In managing that environment, the teacher exercises some control in deciding what experiences will be provided, which will be restricted, and the timing of those experiences.

In creating the learning environment, the teacher should ask:

1) What are the behaviors which this student (individualized instruction, naturally) must acquire to achieve what he wants to achieve later? It may be that the uncertainty of the future demands emphasis on learning how to learn quickly that which is needed, because what is learned today may be outmoded next week, or irrelevant because it could not be predicted in what environment the learner would be operating.

2) Given the decision about what one wishes to learn, what are the sensory modes through which it can best be experienced? How, for instance, can one experience temperature? Obviously, by touch alone. How can one experience color? Obviously, by sight only. What are the experiences which can be experienced by more than one sense, and how does it affect the learning when we employ all the possible senses by which one may experience an event?

3) What constitutes the set of experiences by which one most efficiently learns that which he wishes and needs? This assumes, of course, that there is agreement on the appropriateness of what he wishes and needs.

4) How do I, the teacher, draw the student into working with me in jointly defining the learning environment which is optimal for the student's learning."

Let's see how these notions apply to our topic for these two days. How can a prospective teacher experience the demands of students upon a teacher? Can he do it by hearing some talk about it? Can he experience it by hearing an audio recording of a day or some set of days in a classroom, or some sequence from those days? Can he adequately experience these demands by seeing and hearing them via videotape? All these, it seems, provide a partial sensory experience.

Even with the videotape, the learner (our teacher trainee) misses the proxemics, the feel of the nearness of 25 or whatever other number of students pressing around him, the concentrated body odors, and the other aspects of the context in which the transactions among those in the classroom are taking place. These are some of the thing which the videotape cannot record.

Most of all, the trainee must eventually have to see whether he can cope with the learning environment, whether he can control or guide it. He will not discover his own ability to cope by watching someone else perform, even when he is sitting in the same classroom observing.

Our regular teacher training program has provided a 10-week student teaching experience. We feel that program does not provide the depth and breadth of experience offered in the pilot program, nor does it provide those experiences under the optimal conditions or at the optimal time.

What I'm attempting to suggest that the kind of learning environment I would like for teacher trainees is one which utilizes all their sensory modes, and one which provides a continuing opportunity to practice the desired behaviors in a variety of circumstances. Being with others allows one to see some alternative ways of handling situations, but what works for one may not work for another. One has to develop his own way after having the opportunity to consider and experience several alternatives.

It was that type of thinking which led us at MSU about $2\frac{1}{2}$ years ago to start developing what we now call our pilot program. This is a program which places teacher trainees in a secondary school classroom with another teacher or teachers for about $\frac{1}{4}$ of their academic program at the University. We said that if we really believed that learning by doing was the most effective approach to learning, we should be using more of that approach with our teacher trainees. So we started exploring the possibilities with a curriculum director in one of our school systems, and with a committee of three faculty, one M.A. candidate in Comm-Ed who had taught two years, and with a graduating senior in Comm-Ed.

We recognized that the kinds of experiences we were considering would place heavy demands on the teacher trainees in terms of their own energy committment. We recognized that the staff in the Department of Communication would have to carry on the pilot program in addition to other duties. The curriculum coordinator in the school said that he did not want a one-day-a-week arrangement, but would be willing to start immediately if we would consider five days a week and year 'round.

We recognized the risks of not having the magical number of course credits and grade point averages for certifying that graduation requirements had been met, and that the requirements for teacher certification had been satisfied. To protect against that kind of risk we began developing some performance standards which we would expect the students to meet. We approached that task by asking: What are the things we would want one of our graduates to do before we would be willing to say that the person is a graduate of our teacher training program -- that we believe he is as qualified or more qualified than the graduate of any other comm-speech teacher training program? The current stafe of our answer to that question is contained in the 22 guidelines and approximately 100 concepts which you see in the mimeo I've given to you.

As we look at performance based programs of teacher training, we find three levels of performance noted: 1) Does he know it? 2) Can he do it? 3) Can he guide (direct) others in doing it? The performance criteria in the case of Comm-Speech Education would be the set of communication behaviors which we would hope secondary school students would acquire, and the methods of teaching those behaviors to secondary students. We decided to concentrate on the third level of performance, assuming that if the person could guide others in learning the behaviors, he would have satisfied the first two performance levels.

With that much background, I'd like to take the remaining time to look at a few of the performance criteria we have been using during the past year and share some of our reactions to them as of this time. (These are listed in the "Guidelines" mimeo I have given out.)

GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS MAJORING IN SPEECH-COMMUNICATION

A Pilot Program For Teacher Training

Initiated Fall 1972

I. General Behaviors to be Acquired
II. Concepts to be Mastered

Drafted by:

Jack Bain
David Ralph
L. E. Sarbaugh
Gordon Thomas
Donna MacKeague
Judy Stewart

Initiated September 18, 1972

YOUR INTRODUCTION TO A PILOT PROGRAM IN COMMUNICATION EDUCATION

A number of things have stimulated us to develop this pilot program at this time:

1. Society is changing at an accelerating rate. The amount of communication to which the individual is exposed has increased to avalanche proportions. Society is becoming more and more pluralistic and is faced with problems of increasing complexity.

2. These conditions pose challenges to all aspects of communication in helping individuals gain access to information they need to solve problems, while at the same time coping with the flood of messages to which they are expected to respond. Providing a program to give people help with the problems of access and coping is a big challenge to speech communication departments in universities.

3. It requires preparing all students, and especially those planning to teach in elementary and secondary schools, with a fuller understanding of all aspects of the communication process as it operates between individuals and within society.

Having added bits of intern experiences to the program in recent years, we decided it was time for a bolder step. Several assumptions lead us to develop an intensified intern program. One is that if we accept the learning by doing philosophy we should have teacher trainees in contact with secondary students for a much larger proportion of their degree program. Another is that a person often learns a bit of content more quickly and more intensively when he is involved in teaching it to someone else. Another, related to the first, is that when one operates in the situation in which he later will have full responsibility for direction, he becomes more keenly aware of the problems; then being more keenly aware of the problems, he is more receptive to learning content dealing with the solutions of those problems.

In the present stage of development, we see this program placing the trainee in a public school for one-quarter to one-half of the four-year academic program. The balance of the time would be spent on the university campus, gaining the knowledge to cope with the needs found in the teaching role in the public school.

Setting proficiency standards becomes a very critical aspect in the development of this type of program. A set of guidelines is needed for students in the program and for those working with them in teaching and advising roles. To provide such a set of guidelines, a committee of four Department of Communication Faculty at Michigan State University and two recent Communication-Education graduates have developed 22 objectives and nearly 100 concepts. They had many useful suggestions from the Okemos School staff and the MSU College of Education. They also have started reviewing the experiences available to students in MSU classes and in interm activities which would contribute to developing the behaviors desired for a Communication-Education graduate at MSU. These materials are assembled here for those involved in the program.

Revised Draft: 9/13/72

Guidelines for Performance of Students Majoring in Communication-Speech

Those enrolled in this program will be expected to develop the abilities required of all teachers as well as those abilities dealing with the teaching of speech-communication. We expect the students to demonstrate creativity in their own learning and in their teaching. They should have plans for activities that will continually stimulate and contribute to their intellectual and social-emotional growth. They should want to teach, and be able to relate to people and show concern for people.

The objectives stated in Part I are generally in terms of behavior which the teacher trainee is expected to develop in the secondary school students with whom he works. This assumes that the trainee will become competent in these behaviors in order to guide students in developing them. Some of the objectives are stated solely in terms of the trainee's growth. The latter come near the end of the list in Part I.

Part II is a list of concepts which students should be able to explicate and apply. These are tools which students will use in achieving the more general objectives.

Part III (not included in these Proceedings) is a statement indicating some of the ways in which students may develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to satisfy the objectives. Students will be encouraged to develop individual approaches to achieving the levels of performance sought for certification in communication and teaching.

PART I

Twenty objectives have been set forth as guidelines for the trainee, his instructors, his advisor, and others who work with the trainee in planning his program, carrying it out, and in evaluating his progress.

The trainee is expected to guide secondary school students with whom he works in:

1. Creating, presenting, and evaluating oral and written messages.

   The student should be able to state the objectives of his message; analyze his audience; create and discover content (including evidence and reasoning); construct messages, taking into account the content, organization, word choice, and sentence structure; develop style(s) of delivery and presentation; plan and utilize feedback; and evaluate his and others' messages.

2. Developing their abilities in problem solving and decision-making.

   The student should be able to understand and state a problem; analyze the problem; list and consider possible solutions to the problem, select and verify his solution; and implement the solution. He must learn the principles of rational decision-making and be able to apply them in his daily living; and he must be able to give consideration to those non-rational factors which influence problem solving and decision-making.

3. Developing modes of conflict resolution which will re-establish compatible relationships.

   It is expected that both the trainee and his students will have opportunities both to observe and experience conflict. Each should identify modes of conflict resolution and apply these modes appropriately to the conflicts in which he finds himself. While no "sure-fire" method of resolving conflict is available, the student should be aware of several alternatives and the ways they operate, including argumentation and debate; persuasion through a combination of logical reasoning, high credibility, and psychological appeals; the seeking for equality versus "one-upmanship"; encouraging the opponent to present his view fully to further his own understanding of the problem; discovery of common goals and the seeking out of common means; role reversal; empathy; metacommunication; etc. The student should understand that the choice of alternatives may often be determined by the circumstances and intensity of the conflict, personalities involved, etc.

4. Understanding the role of conflict and crisis as contributors to constructive change.

   The student should recognize that conflict and crisis often focus attention on issues and problems and produce enough discomfort to stimulate active search for solutions. He should be able to understand and use the processes of argumentation and debate, discussion, parliamentary procedure, conference, interview, etc., as well as the concepts of reasoning and evidence, credibility, and motivation in effecting change in the operation of government, business, labor, education, and social organizations, as well as in interpersonal communication.

5. Reading, analyzing, appreciateing and responding to literature on their own initiative.

   The student should be able to recognize the role of literature in providing insight into past, present, and future styles of life. He should be able to discuss the relationship of literature to current social issues and the role literature can play in arousing social concern. He should be able to experience the relaxation and enjoyment one can find through literature, and to form judgements concerning specific examples of literature.

6. Using communication principles to identify, analyze, and solve contemporary social problems.

   The student should be made aware -- both from a theoretical as well as from a practical point of view -- that communication is functional to all of life, that all human beings employ communication when they interact within a society although this may be at different levels and through different forms. He should be helped to employ communication in handling societal problems more effectively and with a maximal degree of satisfaction.

7. Learning the evolution of our present conceptualization of communication as a basis for extending their knowledge and understanding of the communication process.

   The students should be able to talk about his heritage in communication from both its humanistic and behavioral science approaches. He should be able to discuss with others the relationships between communication concepts and principles and those in other disciplines. He should understand the value of models and theories in helping us become aware of functions of the communication process which we might otherwise miss.

8. Understanding a systems and process view of the world and the application of that view to analyzing communication events.

   Stress identification of elements, sets and subsets, the interdependence of elements, the dynamic aspects of process, and the problems with specifying beginnings and ends of events, consequences, and effects.

9. Recognizing and understanding both the common and the unique aspects of the several modes of inquiry as they relate to the process of communication.

   The student should come to see such common elements among the modes of inquiry as defining the problem, deriving hypotheses, selecting sources of data and assessing their quality, differentiating between fact and inference, and recognizing the limits of conclusions drawn from data that are alwyas incomplete and tentative. Among the unique aspects would be the techniques used in debate, historical research, survey research, and experimental research. This focus on methods of inquiry should give students a basis for reading research reprots and applying the findings from those reports to communication strategies.

10. Assessing the characteristics of the modes of communication -- interpersonal, group, and mass.

    As students learn the characteristics of the modes of communication, they should be able to predict which of the media, or which combinations of media, would produce what kind of results for a given message in a given situation.

11. Using communication principles and skills to achieve goals in a variety of settings.

    The student needs to adapt and to adjust his communication strategies to varying conditions of place, size of group, degree of formality, etc., so as to perform satisfactorily in daily activities. To operate comfortably under varied conditions, the student should possess a broad range of skills and techniques from the use of group dynamics to the formal rules of parliamentary procedure.

12. Developing the communication skills exemplified in forensics and debate.

    The student may demonstrate these skills in forensics and debate contests, or he may demonstrate them in non-competitive forensics and debate activities. He may demonstrate these skills while participating in

community projects which would involve presentations before such community groups as service clubs, PTA, church, etc.

13. Identifying barriers to communication and the means of overcoming those barriers.

    The trainee will involve students in developing a comprehensive list of barriers to communication and in applying those communication principles which would help a person cope with the particular barrier he is facing.

14. Analyzing their own communication as a way of analyzing communication generally.

    This would involve identifying what in A's messages produced what responses in B and vice versa. It would require identifying the reasons for the responses, then developing principles of communication from each analysis.

15. Understanding principles of motivation as they operate in the communication process.

    The student should understand how motivational principles may be used in planning communication strategies, especially in selecting appeals to be used in designing messages.

16. Understanding the nature of language and language codes, both verbal and nonverbal, and understanding the impact of language on societies, life styles, and individual and group responses to communication.

    This requires stressing the structure of words and sentences, the relativity of meaning, the arbitrariness of symbols, the interaction of verbal and nonverbal codes, and the different aspects of meaning-- denotative, connotative, and structural.

17. Communicating cross-culturally.

    Recognize that in those communication situations we label cross-cultural the participants are more heterogeneous in beliefs and values, and the meanings elicited by symbols are more likely to differ. The knowledge of the other person is less, and there is greater difference in the values of all variable operating in any cross-cultural situation, although the variables are the same as in non-cross-cultural situations. Those engaged in cross-cultural communication often fail to recognize that the variables are the same, but the values of the variable differ vastly more in the cross-cultural setting, making effective feedback even more critical.

18. Developing skills for critical consumption of communication.

    Students need skills to handle the increasingly large volume of messages directed to persons everywhere. The goal is to help them become discriminating consumers of messages. This requires a selection of that to which they will attend; assessing the validity, reliability and intent of the messages; and determining the meaningfulness for one's life and for society.

19. Assessing own communication ability levels and seeking experiences appropriate for continued growth in communication behavior.

20. Developing ethical positions in their communication, recognizing that one's ethic determines his communication.

    The way in which a communicator treats his fellowman is crucial to the outcome of any communication in which he engages. The student should be made aware of the ethical options which are available to him. If, for example, one subscribes to a utilitarian ethic, how does this affect his communication behavior; or if one subscribes to a Judaic-Christian ethic, how does this influence his communication? Having explored different options, encourage each student to develop an ethical position, be able to justify it, and recognize that it likely will expand and change as the person grows and matures.

The last two objectives focus more specifically on the trainee rather than on his guiding of students, although they will relate to his effectiveness in guiding students. We believe the trainee, above all, should be expected to:

1. Demonstrate sound communication principles in his own daily interaction with his students and other people.

2. Demonstrate the ability to employ teaching styles that are appropriate to a given situation -- students, content, physical and social environment -- so as to maximize the learning and involvement of the students.

   The trainee will state a situation in which he would employ a didactic style and demonstrate it in that situation; state a situation in which he would use simulation and demonstrate simulation in that setting; state a situation in which he would use a Socratic style and demonstrate it; etc. He should demonstrate use of physical settings appropriate to content, size of group, and teaching objectives. He should demonstrate that he can create different social environments to achieve different types of learning goals with different types of students. In the course of these experiences, the trainee should perfect styles of teaching that are best for him in different types of situations.

The 22 items stated above will be provided to trainees, and to university and secondary school staff working with the Pilot Program.

PART II

To be considered competent in speech communication, there are several basic concepts which a person must know. A student's knowing in this case will be judged on the basis of a definition and an illustration of the use of a concept.

These concepts are the tools for planning and analyzing communication acts.

As with any such listing, it should be considered incomplete and continually subject to change. The list is not ordered, nor are different levels of concepts noted. It is expected that additional concepts will be added at all levels.

The following concepts will serve as the initial list to guide students in their study:

1. Physical, social and linguistic context
2. Source evaluation
3. Group pressure
4. Social support
5. Primacy-recency
6. Fear appeal
7. One-sided, two-sided message
8. Selective perception
9. Selective exposure
10. Selective retention
11. Assimilation--contrast effects
12. Relativity of meaning
13. Breakdown (communication)
14. Mass (audience)
15. Group
16. Interpersonal
17. Process
18. Risk
19. Induction
20. Deduction
21. Evidence
22. Argumentation
23. Persuasion
24. Information
25. Complementary (Interpersonal)
26. Symmetrical (Interpersonal)
27. Multiple channel
28. Rule
29. Reward/effort
30. Attention
31. Effect (of communication)
32. Feedback
33. Media
34. Definition
35. System
36. Probability
37. Population
38. Sample
39. Hypothesis
40. Statistical significance
41. Principle
42. Dissonance
43. Counter-attitudinal advocacy
44. Role playing
45. Immunization (to persuasion)
46. Conflict
47. Conflict resolution
48. Concept formation
49. Fact
50. Value
51. Control
52. Norm
53. Position
54. Role
55. Reinforcement
    - Positive (reward)
    - Negative (punishment)
56. Channel
57. Source
58. Message
59. Receiver
60. Language
61. Code
62. Symbol
63. Sign
64. Non-verbal
    - Gesture
    - Space
    - Time
    - Movement

65. Diffusion
66. Innovator
67. Early adopter
68. Middle majority
69. Late adopter
70. Awareness stage
71. Interest information stage
72. Evaluation stage
73. Trail stage
74. Adoption stage
75. Social distance
76. Comprehension
77. Response
78. Reasoning
79. Forensics
80. Debate
81. Claim
82. Warrant
83. Structure
84. Message structure
85. Group structure
86. Communication structure
87. Communication
88. Rhetoric
89. Evaluation
90. Learning

COMPETENCY-BASED INSTRUCTION:

AN APPLICATION TO A METHODS OF TEACHING COMMUNICATION COURSE

William D. Brooks
Purdue University

Many professional education programs have undergone sweeping changes over the past few years. One of the changes is competency-based instruction. In competency-based instruction, the desired behaviors are identified, specified and described behaviorally, and demonstrated by the learner. The demonstration of proficiency in the skill or behavior is required for each identified competency before credit is awarded.

The following application of the competency-based model of instruction is based upon the following assumptions:

(1) Individualized instruction facilitates learning at one's own rate.

(2) Learning is meaningful when the gap between theory and application is bridged.

(3) Material and practice should be replicated only when reinforcement seems necessary.

(4) Instructional objectives facilitate the student's understanding of what he is trying to learn.

(5) Demonstration and verification of learning can be done whenever the student is ready.

(6) Student and teacher work better in a one-to-one relationship.

(7) Assessments are based on some overt performance by the student -- a product or a behavior.

(8) Assessment should include and even focus, primarily, upon the relatively high levels of learning -- analyzing, problem-solving, synthesizing, creating, and evaluating.

In an effort to implement the principles identified above, the following program of instruction was developed for the course, Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School.

Methods of Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School

I. OBJECTIVES:

1. To acquire knowledge and understanding relative to teaching speech communication in the secondary school as included in the text, assigned readings, and class lectures or discussions. Evidence of such learning will be scoring at or above the 80% level on the written multiple-choice comprehensive examination.

2. To acquire behavioral competencies in:
   a. writing behavioral objectives
   b. lecturing
   c. indirect teaching
   d. developing strategies of instruction
   e. analyzing the metacommunication of students
   f. monitoring and analyzing teacher behavior
   g. evaluating student communication behavior
   h. measuring learning outcomes

II. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES:

1. Extensive reading by each class member including the required reading of assigned materials and the optional reading of materials on the bibliography or other materials. Especially significant periodicals include: The Speech Teacher, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Speech Monographs, Journal of Communication, Central States Speech Journal, Southern Speech Journal, Western Speech, and Today's Speech. Our text is Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School, by William D. Brooks and Gustav Friedrich, Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1972.

2. Lecture and discussion in class.

3. Student-initiated questions, statements, evaluations, and other comments in class to clarify or evaluate concepts related to teaching speech in the secondary school.

4. Student-teacher conferences as requested by the student or the instructor.

5. Practice, evaluation, and feedback relative to proficiency in the behavioral competencies described above.

III. MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION:

1. Each of the projects (1 through 11) will be evaluated according to the criteria established for each competency and included on each project instruction sheet.

2. In addition, project 11, the written final examination, will be evaluated as explained under I of this paper.

3. The projects include:

Project #1 -- Behavioral Objectives
Project #2 -- Lecturing Skill
Project #3 -- Indirect Teaching Skill
Project #4 -- 50 Minute Lesson Plan
Project #5 -- Unit Outline
Project #6 -- DAM Analysis
Project #7 -- Interaction Analysis
Project #8 -- Critiquing Speeches
Project #9 -- Writing Objective Test
Project #10 -- Writing Essay Test
Project #11 -- Final Examination

4. Projects 1 through 10 may be repeated as many times as necessary to reach adequate competency, except that all work must be completed by the last official day of classes.

IV. FEEDBACK

It is the aim of the instructor to provide feedback information as soon as possible as it becomes available. Each student should feel free to ask for feedback and for the clarification of feedback information at any time.

Five of the project descriptions follow as examples of the application of the competency-based model.

Project #1
Writing Behavioral Objectives

Behavioral Objectives: The student teacher will write at least eight educational objectives which are behavioral according to Mager's (1962) or Brooks-Friedrich (1973) criteria, at least three of which would be classified in the affective domain. Further:

(1) All eight objectives must relate to a single unit of instruction that could be taught in one 50 minute class period or in no more than five 50 minute class periods.

(2) The parts of at least three of the eight objectives must be labeled correctly.

(3) Competency will be demonstrated by the project containing no more than three errors, or by being accepted by the S.C.A. for their Behavioral Objectives Bank.

Exemplary models of behavioral objectives can be found in Brooks and Friedrich (1973) Kibler, Barker and Miles (1970), and in Mager (1962).

Project #3
Indirect Teaching Skill

Behavioral Objective: A mini-lesson (5 to 7 minutes) will be taught in a micro-teaching situation in which the following competencies will be demonstrated:

(1) Effective Use of Questions -- Factors included are: the use of a variety of questions, teacher's questions, the teacher did not answer her own questions, the teacher asked students to rationally justify their responses, the teacher's questions brought other students into the discussion by getting them to respond to first student's answer, the teacher's questions asked students for more information or more meaning, the teacher asked divergent questions, i.e., asked students to make a prediction or speculation, the teacher asked convergent questions, i.e., asked students how they felt about something or how good, bad, effective or ineffective something was or would be, the teacher avoided vague or general questions which prevented satisfactory answers, the teacher avoided too many questions requiring one word and/or yes and no answers, and the teacher allowed students ample time to respond, the teacher asked a large proportion of

"higher order questions," i.e., questions that called for reflection and thought rather than rote memory, the teacher's reaction to a student's response was appropriate in that his reaction did not threaten the student even when the student was wrong, and the teacher was able to keep the discussion directed toward the purpose of the lesson.

(2) Effective Use of Reinforcement -- Factors included are: praises and encourages, accepts and/or uses ideas of students, reinforcement was sincere and not repetitious.

(3) Provides and Elicits Feedback -- Factors to be considered are: the use of non-verbal skills and silence to elicit feedback, the use of non-verbal communication to provide feedback, accuracy in reading the non-verbal communication of students, verbally providing feedback, and the elicitation of feedback evenly throughout the class, not just from "selected indicators."

(4) Demonstrates Supportiveness -- Factors included are: encouraged the students by non-verbal cues such as smiling, nodding his head, or writing answers on the blackboard, the teacher rarely or never discourages students by use of such comments as "no!" "Wrong!" "That's not it!" "Of course not!" or otherwise verbally express negative feeling, the teacher rarely or never scowls, expresses annoyance or impatience, and the teacher's response to the students' questions and comments was enthusiastic.

The micro-teaching will be taped (audio or video) and the interaction analyzed using the Flanders Interaction Analysis system. Competencies will be demonstrated by the Analysis revealing:

(1) A minimum of 40% student-talk, (8 &9)
(2) A minimum of 40% teacher-talk in the indirect categories, (1,2,3, &4)
(3) Questions across at least three levels,
(4) No more than one poor question pattern, (4,5; 4,6, or 7; 4,8,5; or 4,9,5;)
(5) Three or more 2's and/or 3's
(6) Three or more 1's and/or 2's
(7) The use of silence, questions or other means to elicit a clarification of a student's idea (paraphrases, re-states, or defines); use of a question to test on student's understanding of his (the teacher's) comment; on use of paraphrasing a student's idea or response in order to check on its interpretation.

Project #6
Discipline-Achievement-Mental Health Analysis

1. Do a written analysis of a criterion-videotaped interaction. The analysis must be 90% correct when compared to the criterion analysis.

2. During the first week of your student teaching assignment you are to observe carefully one class you will eventually teach. After observing the meta-communication transactions and after gathering other data by other means, you are to write a description of the class in terms of the DAM Paradigm. After describing the class in regard to these three factors and in regard to how these factors are interacting, predict the problems and opportunities you are likely to face in your student teaching of this class. Also, indicate your proposed coping strategy for the problems and show how that strategy accords with the DAM Paradigm.

3. Repeat the process described in #1 except that the analysis will be done on one student, rather than on the class as a whole.

4. These papers will be due by the end of the 3rd week of student teaching.

Project #7
Interaction Analysis Skill

As a result of reading the chapter in our text on interaction analysis, of observing and participating in the class discussion and demonstration on interaction analysis, and of completing the Brooks, Friedrich, Barth audio-tutorial program in the Audio-Visual Center (and repeating the program as much as is needed), you should be able to:

1. Code the interaction as it occurs in a 5-10 minutes teaching episode;

2. Prepare an interaction analysis matrix;

3. Use the data in the matrix to describe the teacher-student behavior or to answer questions referring to such behavior, and

4. Prescribe a self-improvement program for the teacher observed -- a program that expands the teacher's behavior repertory. Competency is recognized with the achievement of 90% accuracy with a video-taped criterion analysis.

Project #8
Critiquing Oral Communication Behavior

1. A written critique or recorded oral critique must have no more than 2 evaluative statements that are contradictory to a criterion critique.

2. The critique must utilize positively reinforcing comments either 100% or in a ratio of 2 to 1 as compared to negative comments.

It has been my experience that attention needs to be given to the adjustment period of students, that period when they re-orient themselves from a norm-referenced approach with norm referenced evaluation to a criterion-referenced approach. Some students have difficulty in disciplining themselves and their self-paced rate is inadequate. These students often require attention and assistance in planning their learning activities.

An individualized, competency-based, mastery learning approach requires more time spent by the teacher than does the traditional approach. Feedback to the student increases in proportion to other activities, the management of micro-teaching laboratories, and video-tape laboratories becomes burdensome. I have found it impossible to teach only during the five scheduled class hours per week. Rather, teaching occurs at almost any hour of the day and two or three evening sessions a week are not uncommon. The students, if they are to become competent professionals do not take the course to fill five class hours or to acquire X number of credits. They take the course in order to learn how to become an effective teacher.

EVALUATION AND PBTE

Kathleen M. Galvin
Northwestern University

When one prominent teacher educator learned that the Florida Department of Education was planning to conduct a training program dealing with performance based teacher certification, he responded cryptically, "It sounds like a good idea if you can figure out what it is."[1] By now people have begun to figure out what it is and the new reaction seems to be, "It sounds like a good idea if you can figure out how to evaluate it."

The evaluation phase of performance based teacher competency programs is in initial stages of development, and to demonstrate this more directly, I would like to share the first two major statements that confronted me as I began research in this area.

> We cannot be sure that measurement techniques essential to both objectivity and to valid assessment of affective and complex cognitive objectives will be developed rapidly enough for the new exit requirements to be any better than the conventional letter grades of the past. Unless heroic efforts are made on both the knowledge and measurement fronts, then PBTE may well have a stunted growth.[2]

> Unfortunately we do not even have a satisfactory list of crucial skills and behaviors which a teacher must possess in order to perform reasonably well and to survive in the ordinary classroom with personal satisfaction.[3]

Rather than attempting to give ready answers, the most honest approach I can take to this subject is to clarify some issues and raise concerns and questions.

Evaluation implies assigning a value and requires the use of (1) criteria, against which the thing being evaluated can be measured, and (2) evidence, the information related to the criteria. The specification of any criteria is based on value judgements and the values of a specific community/culture which a teacher serves dictates the worthiness of any set of criteria. "Effective Teaching" may be defined differently in various situations according to the frames of reference held by evaluators. Thus, evaluation in a teacher education program depends on the criteria or value system created by the program designers and the kinds of evidence they are capable of collecting to relate to the criteria.

In order to focus more closely on evaluation of teachers this paper will consider the following:

(1) the subject of evaluation
(2) the evaluators
(3) possible evaluation processes
(4) valid evaluation programs
(5) potential problems for speech programs.

In our technological world most attention has been given to the systems approach and on a simplified level we can look at the teaching act as containing (1) inputs, (2) throughputs and (3) outputs, each of which give us a basis for evaluation.

Traditionally the input and throughput phases have received much attention as schools have attempted to assess the personality, motivation or content knowledge of a prospective teacher. Because there has been little substantial correlation between entering characteristics of a potential teacher and "teaching effectiveness" this method of evaluation is not being used in PBTE. PBTE evaluation procedures tend to be based on output.

Teacher behavior and/or performance presents a second approach to evaluation wherein attention is focused on the individual's ability to perform a variety of tasks, such as questioning, lecturing, reinforcing, summarizing, etc. This approach is similar to that described by William Brooks in his description of the Purdue program which relies heavily on microteaching and interaction analysis techniques. This approach focuses on teacher output.

The third approach involves a measurement of the pupil behavior or the "consequences" of the teacher's attempt to teach. Teacher effectiveness criteria are worded in terms of pupil achievement which is supposedly related to the teacher's performance. This technique focuses on student output.

A more sophisticated variation of these approaches attempts to evaluate teacher effectiveness according to three levels of performance including knowledge, simulation behavior and actual classroom behavior in varying roles of planner, interactor and evaluator.

Obviously different teacher education programs are adopting unique approaches to PBTE but all programs have the responsibility to make their evaluation procedures known to prospective entrants, thus insuring understanding and agreement between the students and faculty on the goals of the program. This "public" declaration of standards gives students the opportunity to accept or reject a particular program's approach providing, of course, he can find alternative approaches in other programs.

Thus, according to Elam, in a PBTE program performance goals are specified and agreed to in advance and a teacher must either (1) demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or (2) exhibit behaviors known to promote it.[4]

Under PBTE the role of evaluator may be assumed by various individuals with total or shared responsibility for final decisions. Some of the possible evaluators are:

(1) Directors of the teacher educator program
Usually these persons are the program's designers and/or executors, and probably established the criteria for evaluation thus having a personal stake in its success.

(2) Teacher educators from another institution
These persons have little personal involvement in program success and, according to certain authorities, may be more objective in their evaluation.

(3) Professional persons unrelated to teacher education
These individuals may be experts in subject matter or skill and could validly assess pupil competence in their area.

(4) The teacher
The PBTE philosophy is based on an individualized program which suggests the individual may gain part of his growth through self-evaluation techniques.

(5) Peers in teacher education program
Since these students are learning to analyze, evaluate and critique effective teaching, this provides a laboratory for mutual learning and support.

(6) Public school officials
If used as part of an in-service or tenure evaluation program, school administrators or department chairmen may be part of an evaluation team.

(7) State officials
The individuals may represent efforts of the State Department of Education to influence teacher quality and certification within their area.

Any person selected to evaluate in a PBTE program should demonstrate the following: (1) understanding of the objectives which the teacher is supposed to fulfill, (2) knowledge of the situation in which the teaching will take place and (3) understanding and acceptance of various ways in which the same objectives can be accomplished.[5]

Once a program has developed its objectives how may it collect evidence for its evaluation procedure? At present most programs reflect one or a combination of the following three approaches: (1) rating, (2) observation and categorization and (3) pupil testing.

In the rating procedure an observer collects and analyzes evidence to compare with stated criteria but without making a carefully detailed record of the evidence. It involves heavy reliance on subjective or value judgements related to effectiveness and may involve use of scales such as a Likert scale or semantic differentials. Sophisticated scales and trained raters provide ways of compensating for some potential problems with this method.

In the observation procedure selected aspects of teacher or pupil behavior are categorized for objective reporting by an observer. The category system and the sign system are two kinds of observation schedules. Some commonly used scales are those developed by Flanders (verbal), Galloway (nonverbal) and Medley and Metzel (OScAR).

Pupil test scores represent a third approach to evaluation which relies on the gain scores or consequences of the teaching behavior. This approach has received a limited support because (1) many extenuating factors may influence a student's learning, and (2) tests usually do not reflect the wide range of objectives sought by an educational program.

As an overriding evaluation procedure, Richard Turner has created a six criterion level approach which is worth describing. Criterion six refers to the effects of a teacher training program on teacher knowledge and understanding. Criteria five and four refer to its effects on the improvement of teaching in laboratory-type settings. Criterion three deals with the effects of teacher behavior under actual classroom conditions, wheras criterion two deals with effects on pupil behavior of short range duration and criterion one concerns itself with pupil change of long range duration.[6]

Although teacher evaluation is a program goal, at all times members of the PBTE evaluation program should engage in self-evaluation. The following are possible guidelines for program evaluation:

(1) Relevance
This refers to the extent of the relationship existing between the criteria for evaluating teaching and the goals of the educational program.

(2) Interpretability
This refers to conditions which allow the evidence collected to be organized and analyzed in ways which will yield information that can be used for desired purposes.

(3) Reliability
This refers to the consistency between evidence collected and behavior observed, especially if there are multiple observers.

(4) Equity
This refers to the lack of discrimination against a person with a particular teaching style unless it is agreed that his style is not appropriate for accomplishing the objectives of the educational program.[7]

Some of the problems or concerns which educators must consider are:

(1) Long range behavior
Although a student may perform certain teaching behaviors during college years, research has been insufficient to predict the long range teaching behavior of someone who has "mastered" particular skills.

(2) Use of teacher skills
The fact that a teacher can perform a certain behavior does not mean he or she has the decision-making ability or sensitivity to know when and in what combination the skills should be used. Affective or interpersonal teacher skills have received little attention in many programs.

(3) Adequacy of pupil tests
Since many factors other than a specific teacher may account for changes in pupil test scores, an objective estimate of the expected pupil gain should be developed before using gain scores as a primary basis for evaluating teaching.

(4) Affective learning
Teachers of speech communication are concerned with affective learning, but since this area is very difficult to measure and since PBTE requires strict measurement, there may be a tendency to ignore the affective in favor of easily measureable low-level cognitive behavior.

(5) Individualization

Before instituting a PBTE program the practical issue of staff must be considered. An individualized approach without time limits requires many more staff hours which must be provided either through additional staffing or load changes.

(6) Role of federal or state government

The present relationship between institutional assessment and certification is unclear. Educators should be cautious of possible development of uniform standards which do not allow for individual teaching styles or situational differences according to culture or community needs.

(7) Role of Theory

In his critique of PBTE Harry Broudy suggests that the gap between theory and practice may be eliminated (a) by getting rid of theory or (b) by reducing it only to what is needed to perfect the practice. The interrelationship of theory and practice must not be lost to a skills approach.[8]

Thus, having looked at the what, the who, the how and the problems of PBTE, it is appropriate to close with the following challenge:

> But the overriding problem before which the others pale to insignificance is that of the adequacy of measurement instruments and procedures. PBTE can only be successful if there are more adequate means to assess the competency of students.[9]

* * * * *

FOOTNOTES

[1]K. Fred Daniel, "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: What Is It and Why Do We Need It?", Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel, (ed. Joel Bordin), (Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Education, 1971), page 5.

[2]Stanley Elam, "Performance Based Teacher Education, What Is the State of the Art?", (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971), ED 105 166, page 12.

[3]Ibid., page 15.

[4]Ibid., page 8.

[5]K. Fred Daniel, "Developing a County Program for Evaluating Teaching," Teacher Education in Transition, Volume I, (ed. Howard Bosley, (Baltimore, MD: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, May, 1969), page 312.

[6]Elam, op. cit., page 15.

[7]Daniel, "Developing a County Program for Evaluating Teaching," op. cit., page 314-15

[8]Harry Broudy, "A Critique of Performance Based Teacher Education," (Champagne, IL: University of Illinois, 1972), ED 063 274.

[9]Elam, op. cit., page 21.

APPENDIX B

Commissioned Stimulus Statements

on

Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula

Education Priorities Division Group Two

Edward J. Pappas, Chairperson

P R O C E E D I N G S

Speech Communication Association
Summer Conference IX

Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication

Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 12-14, 1973

Edited By
Robert C. Jeffrey
and
William Work

Speech Communication Association
[illegible] Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

PREFACE

In September 1972, the Speech Communication Association sponsored a conference at Airlie House, Virginia to consider long-range goals and priorities for the Association and the profession. The seventeen conferees at the Airlie Conference generated a report (published in the April, 1973 issue of Spectra) that was widely discussed at the 1972 SCA Convention in December. The Legislative Council at that convention approved plans for the 1973 Summer Conference to expand upon the "Airlie Report."

The basic purpose of the Ninth Annual SCA Summer Conference was to extend the impact of the Airlie Conference by democratizing participation. The planners of the Conference predicted that those attending would contribute significantly to thought about the future of the profession by further defining goals, designing implementation strategies, and establishing priorities. To that end, all members of the SCA were invited to participate.

Since the "Airlie Report" presented recommendations in three broad areas—Education, Research, and Futurism—, the major divisions of the Conference were arranged to reflect those areas. Participants in Division A considered Education priorities, those in Division B dealt with Research priorities and those in Division C reflected on Futuristic priorities. Divisions A and B were each further organized into three Groups and Division C into two Groups. Participants, upon registering for the Conference, were asked to select the Division and Group in which he/she would like to participate. The Conference Program, reproduced in this report, sets out the sequence of events within the Groups and Divisions over the one and a half day conference.

The Division directors were asked to keep careful records of the deliberations within the Division, particularly of the recommendations and supporting rationales. They were also asked to collect any materials that were distributed to the Groups for reproduction in these Proceedings. Division Directors Ronald Allen and Lloyd Bitzer of the University of Wisconsin and Frank Dance of the University of Denver were diligent and aggressively original in planning for the work of the Divisions, and they were prompt in forwarding materials for publication. I am deeply indebted to them. The product of their labors and those of the Group chairmen forms the basis for this publication.

Major contributions were made to the Conference by Neil Postman of New York University who delivered a provocative and stimulating keynote address, and by L.S. Harms of the University of Hawaii, who concluded the conference with a look into the future, as the luncheon speaker. Transcripts of their addresses appear in these Proceedings.

The Director of the Conference is grateful to William Work, Executive Secretary of the SCA, for his efficiency in coordinating the efforts of many people who contributed to the Conference. The major kudos, however, go to the participants who generated the thought represented on the pages that follow.

Robert C. Jeffrey
Conference Director

PROGRAM
SCA SUMMER CONFERENCE IX

Palmer House, Chicago — July 12-14, 1973

Thursday Evening, July 12

8:00 pm	Keynote Address: Neil Postman, New York University
9:00 pm	No Host Reception

Friday, July 13

9:00 am	'The Airlie Conference,' First Vice-President Samuel L. Becker
9:15 a.m.	SCA Summer Conference IX Overview, President Robert C. Jeffrey
9:30-9:55 am	Organization of Conference Divisions
Division A:	Education Priorities, Ronald R. Allen, Director
Division B:	Research Priorities, Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director
Division C:	Futuristic Priorities, Frank E.X. Dance, Director
9:55-10:15 am	Coffee Break
10:15 am-12:15 pm	Division Groups Meet
A: Group 1:	Competency-Based Teacher Education, Gustav Friedrich, Chairman
Group 2:	Communication in the Secondary School Language Arts Curricula, Edward Pappas, Chairman
Group 3:	New Thrusts in Departmental Organization and the Preparation of Teachers, Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairman
B: Group 1:	The Future of Communication Research, Gerald R. Miller, Chairman
Group 2:	Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making, Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman
Group 3:	Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech, Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairman
C: Group 1:	The Communication Needs & Rights of Mankind, L.S. Harms, Alton Barbour, Chairmen
Group 2:	Future Communication Technologies: Hardware and Software, William Conboy, Larry Wilder, & Jack Barwind, Chairmen
12:15-2:00 pm	Lunch Break
2:00-5:30 pm	Division Group Meetings Continue
8:00-10:30 pm	Optional Division Group Meetings

Saturday, July 14

9:00-10:40 am	Plenary Sessions: Divisions A, B, C.
10:40-11:00 am	Coffee Break
11:00-12:00 noon	Conference Plenary Session: Recommendations and Priorities
12:15-2:00 pm	Conference Luncheon Address: L.S. Harms, University of Hawaii, "The Communicatinn Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

Presiding at all General Sessions: Robert C. Jeffrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface — Robert C. Jeffrey, Conference Director. i

Keynote Address — Neil Postman. 1

Report of Division A: Education Priorities:

- Overview — R. R. Allen, Division Director. 10
- Group One Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Gustav W. Friedrich, Group Chairperson. . . . 10
- Group Two Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Edward J. Pappas, Group Chairperson. 12
- Group Three Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Group Chairperson. . . 15
- Summary
- Appendix A: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Competency-Based Teacher Education. 22
- Appendix B: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula. 50
- Appendix C: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers. 85

Report of Division B: Research Priorities

- Overview — Lloyd F. Bitzer, Division Director. 120
- Group One Report: Recommendations — Gerald R. Miller, Group Chairperson. 121
- Group Two Report: Recommendations — Kenneth B. Andersen, Group Chairperson . . .124
- Group Three Report: — Franklyn S. Haiman, Group Chairperson. . . .128

Report of Division C. Futuristic Priorities

- Overview — Frank E.X. Dance, Division Director. 133
- Group One Report — Alton Barbour, Group Chairperson. 133
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Group Two Report: — William Conboy, Larry Wilder, Jack Barwind, Group Co-Chairpersons. . . . 135
  - General Statement
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Appendix: Prepared Materials and Bibliographies on Future Communication Technologies. 137

Luncheon Address: "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future" — L.S. Harms. 158